DEAN JAROS

BRADLEY C. CANON

University of Kentucky

Transmitting Basic Political Values: The Role of the Educational System

> It is the consciences, norms, habits . . . that define what uses of control are legitimate and what are illegitimate. . . . And if these . . . are not appropriate to a particular political form, then no written constitutions, no guarantees, no prescribed codes, no laws will achieve it.[1]

The stability of regimes and the viability of their basic political practices depend upon the widespread acceptance of values which support them. The role of prevailing political culture is thus more basic to the operation of political systems than is formal institutional arrangement;[2] indeed, the latter depends in part on the former. It is therefore of fundamental importance to know how such cultural attributes and their attendant political values come to be internalized by the masses of citizens.

Recent research has dramatically demonstrated that basic affective political orientations are largely developed during childhood and adolescence. By the time an individual reaches high school age, he is in many ways politically well developed.[3] Though the data and systematic methodology of these studies are new, the basic concern with youthful political learning is venerable and enduring; indeed, it is found in the ancient literature of both Western and Oriental cultures as well as that of all intermediate times up to the present day.[4]

Prominently featured in much of this literature is the role of formal educational practices. Philosophers, educators, and both democratic and totalitarian political leaders have thought them the key to indoctrinating desired political values in the young. Though the list of proponents of political teachings is both prestigious and long, it is well to note that most of the propositions these thinkers have advanced are curiously disconnected from bodies of empirical findings. Despite appearances, a great indoctrinative role for educational systems is only a possibility. Indeed, the recent systematic research noted above, though it makes only a small beginning on the problem of discovering the *processes* by which orientations are transmitted and learned, focuses primarily on the family as an agent of

94

childhood political socialization.[5] But since schools occupy a large propor-
tion of the attention of individuals during a period of their lives when they
acquire many enduring dispositions, and since, especially at the secondary
level, they address themselves to certain kinds of manifest political con-
cerns, they clearly enjoy a great deal of *potential* as political indoctrinators.
How much *actual* influence they have is another and largely unknown
matter.

This paper seeks to promote inquiry into the school as an agent of polit-
ical socialization by suggesting typologies of processes which are involved
in the transmission of values. Clearly, if progress is to be made in this area,
meaningful, testable hypotheses must be developed and empirical findings
must be placed in an orderly conceptual framework. These typologies,
based on existing political and educational research, are addressed to these
tasks.

The role of the educational system in the transmission of societal norms
must be considered from two perspectives. On the one hand, there is the
value output of the schools. Patently, it is necessary to know how political
cues are communicated from the educational environment and to know
what impact they have upon their recipients. Some consideration of alter-
nate communication processes that may be operative in schools is called
for. However, educational system output by itself presents only a partial
picture of the societal value-transmission process. It is also necessary to ask
how the educational system comes to transmit given political values. That
is, we must know something of the identity and efficacy of alternate sources
of *value input* to the schools.

BASIC POLITICAL VALUES

Before examining either input or output processes, it is well to consider
briefly the kinds of political values to which they may be relevant.
Processes may be differentially efficacious with respect to given kinds of
norms.

The citizen values which underlie the basic features of political society
are of three fundamental types. First, there are *participatory values*. These
include norms about the desirability and obligatory nature of personally
participating in civic affairs, what Almond and Verba call the sense of
civic competence.[6] Of course, in the United States, advocacy of this value
as a keystone of democratic order has been nearly universal. In addition,
however, an important kind of participation involves the citizen's ability to
demand responsible treatment from the administrators—as opposed to the
makers—of public policy. Almond and Verba call this willingness to de-
mand one's just due from government the sense of subject competence.[7]
Research suggests that the incidence of participatory values in the mass
citizenry is critical to the degree of democracy in political systems.

Second are *regime-level substantive values.*[8] There are at least two kinds. First, feelings about who should have access to the authoritative decision-making processes are obviously of crucial importance. For example, denial of full citizenship to the working classes has in some regimes led to revolutionary behavior. Similarly, resistance to Negro participation in the American policy is producing important political repercussions. Second, basic regime-affect often subsumed under headings of loyalty and patriotism is a familiar theme. Historically, many governments have fallen victim to alienated segments of the population (e.g., Bourbon France or Czarist Russia). These kinds of values affect the very existence of any type of regime; conceptually speaking, they are not related to the particular posture (i.e., democratic, authoritarian, etc.) of the system.

Third, there are values pertaining to relatively specific questions of public policy called *issue values.* Though less basic in that they do not involve the fundamental character or existence of the political order, such norms are of immense significance for the nature of public life. This is especially true where continuing social cleavages produce policy conflicts of an enduring nature; for example, the long struggle over social welfare legislation in many Western countries.

OUTPUT PROCESSES

With which of these values, if any, does the school engage? What modes of transmission, if any, produce an effect on pupils? It is possible, of course, that the formal educational system has a negligible or insignificant role in the transmission of values. If this were the case, research energies could be more usefully expended on the study of other agents. However, despite the general paucity of data, there is some systematic evidence that educational practices can lead to distinctive political attitudes and values. For example, it appears on the basis of carefully conducted cross-national research that among Western cultures quantity of education correlates with possession of participatory values supportive of democracy.[9] Similarly, within given nations, persons with greater amounts of education are more likely to subscribe to regime-level substantive values thought consonant with democracy.[10]

It seems highly likely, therefore, that some kinds of political effects do flow from the educational experience. Though the implications of these findings may be immense, they tell us very little about *how* educational experience influences political values. This consideration, of course, is a prime research priority.

There are six major processes by which the basic political values described above may be communicated by the educational system. Pupils may acquire values through: (1) participatory and permissive classroom milieus, (2) curricular content alone, (3) curricular content mediated by

"effective" teachers, (4) teachers' overt expression of their own values in classroom situations, (5) teachers' more casual expression of their own values in less structured out-of-class situations, (6) pupil identification with particular teachers and adoption of values which the teacher is perceived to hold. Though these processes are conceptually distinct, they cannot be thought of as mutually exclusive. Two or more may operate simultaneously and reinforce each other in their effects.

1. *Participatory and permissive classroom milieus.*—Manifestly nonpolitical educational experiences may have implications for the learning of *participatory values.* Educators have long argued that permissive and participatory classroom milieus contribute to the development of critical, "reflective," and involved citizens, who are considered to be the keystone of democratic society.[11] Though these hypotheses have been advanced with varying degrees of empirical support, a landmark study in cross-cultural research indeed indicates that adults who recall being able to complain about unfair treatment in school and participating in classroom discussions feel much more competent to engage in democratic political affairs.[12] Participation in non-political settings may well lead to norms of civic activity, which are certainly basic to the maintenance of democratic regimes. These assertions appear highly significant and are deserving of thorough investigation.

2. *Curricular content.*—The belief that curricular content is important to the development of basic political values is widespread. Indeed, some individuals hold this assumption so fervently that they are willing to take quite strong measures to control the political content of educational material to which children are exposed in the schools.[13] A decline in children's commitment to national or regional (regime-level substantive) values is feared as a consequence of "alien" ideas in instructional matter. The great amount of attention paid to questions of the history and social studies curriculum and textbooks suggests that educators also perceive a relation between educational content and childhood political values. Concerned about how best to prepare youngsters to cope with increasingly complex political life, they have in recent years implemented or proposed instructional programs which emphasize such participatory stances as gathering and evaluating information, involvement in civic affairs, and exercise of one's rights. Also, there has been much concern with regime-level substantive values in that the social conflict-solving functions of politics is stressed along with the dysfunctional consequences of ethnocentrism.[14] Though the apparent congruence of curriculum changes and the stated educational goals is impressive and though the amount of thoughtful work expended on this problem is prodigious, the quantity of systematic data as to the greater efficacy of new social studies curricula is small. Unfortunately, many writers addressing this problem use evaluational criteria which are inadequate for pur-

poses of broader theory.[15] Moreover, such systematic data as exist are not conclusive in demonstrating the efficacy of particular instructional patterns.[16]

Even more disquieting, the evidence that social studies courses, whatever their nature, have a discernible impact on the political orientations of pupils is at best mixed. Some authors assert that some substantive values ("jingoism," etc.) can be changed in schoolchildren as a consequence of exposure to social studies courses, though feelings of competence and desires to participate in civic affairs generally do not appear to be affected.[17] But, on the other hand, many other studies are unable to demonstrate that social studies courses have a significant impact of any kind (even with respect to transfer of information) on pupils who are exposed to them.[18] In fact, the results of an extremely sophisticated study employing a survey of national samples of both pupils and social studies teachers are so discouraging that the investigators comment, "Indeed, the increments are so minuscule as to raise serious questions about the utility of investing in government courses in the senior high-school."[19] These results suggest that any effect of the formal educational process on political socialization is not due to prescribed content alone.

3. *Curricular content mediated by "effective" teachers.*—There may be conditioning factors such that when curricular content alone is considered, no political effects upon children can be observed. Such factors may attach to the teacher as such. Of course, in and of itself, this is not a startlingly original assertion. Indeed, many scholars whose chief concern is curriculum or text content seem to be concerned that teachers' classroom behavior may nullify the anticipated benefits of proposed programs.[20]

This comports with other scholars' great concern with "teacher effectiveness." Obviously, professional educators of all fields feel that the nature of the teacher is a critical variable in the educational experience. However, the evidence on this point again is not definitive. Generally, it is asserted that such qualities as "warmth," "stimulation," "organization," and "responsibility" (variously operationally defined) lead to greater ability to communicate information, stimulate thinking, and affect values of students.[21] Though these researches are significant and interesting, most of them do not directly measure effectiveness in terms of substantive attitudinal changes induced in pupils. Indeed, in a recent bibliography on research in teacher effectiveness, fewer than 4 per cent of the studies listed relied on this criterion.[22] The usual standard of effectiveness is evaluation of the teacher by principals or other supervisory personnel, other teachers, outside experts, pupils, or the teacher himself.[23] Though these methods adequately determine teaching success for some purposes, it is clear that pupil change as noted above is the most relevant criterion for investigating political socialization.

Hence, insofar as political learning is concerned, the role of teacher mediation of curricular values is very much of an open question fully deserving of thorough investigation. The "warm," "stimulating" teacher may be able to produce greater cognitive and attitudinal changes in the political orientations of pupils than his more impersonal, lethargic counterpart. This means that any set of values associated with him will be effectively communicated. And, especially in participatory and regime-level substantive realms, curricula may provide these values.

4. *Teachers' overt expression of their own values in the classroom.*—Of course, there are values other than those found in curricula to which teachers may respond in communicating with pupils. Most obvious among these are the teachers' own attitudes and beliefs. These may constitute a major basis for any change induced in pupils regardless of their congruence with the curricular content. It is probable that many teachers hold regime-level substantive values at variance with those which characterize formal educational materials, and virtually all have far more differentiated attitudinal structures than could be expressed in the prescriptions of school curricula. Moreover, most teachers probably entertain a variety of *issue values*, while curricula are generally silent on these topics.[24] If issue values are in fact transmitted through the educational system, almost certainly teachers' views are important here.

The assertion that teachers communicate their values to children is hardly startling. Both alarmists and more dispassionate observers have routinely assumed that teachers are able to transmit their political views to their pupils. Scholarly writers deplore the direct inculcation of issue values or applaud the transmission of broadly "democratic" (regime-level substantive or participatory) attitudes. Others concerned with the teacher's role in the development of children's political values assert that teachers should prepare children to deal "critically" with value questions while not transmitting any particular substantive orientation.[25] Though these may be desirable goals, there are virtually no data in terms of observed pupil change on the effects of such value roles. Moreover, research on teacher behavior, as distinct from pupil effects, suggests that the overt value role of teachers is one of abdication.[26] Despite the best efforts of modern, thoughtful educators, teachers, abetted by the texts from which they work, strike poses of exaggerated objectivity. Perhaps in deference to perceived pressures from societal groups, teachers may avoid formal discussion of any except the most elementary regime-level substantive values (loyalty and patriotism). Not only is there little value transfer, it is alleged, but students are not even made aware that political issues necessarily involve questions of valuation.[27]

Thus, the picture of the value role of the teacher is for the most part one of overt neutrality. This would seem to preclude the entrance of most of

the teachers' political values, especially issue values, to the classroom learning situation. However, Hess and Torney's extensive study of childhood political learning indicates that as children proceed through their years of schooling, their political value structures come increasingly to aproximate those of their teachers.[28] It is tempting to infer a causal link. If such a link exists simultaneously with overt neutrality, some sort of unobserved or latent process is operative. One may envision two such processes.

5. *Value expression outside of class.*—First, it is possible that values are transferred from teacher to child during contacts outside the classroom context. Informal, after-school conversations or extracurricular activities might provide conducive environments. Teachers feel less constrained in their behavior outside the classroom and might well be willing to embark upon discussions of political matters considered quite inappropriate for the formal, structured setting of the classroom. Not only is this kind of contact likely to result in the exposure of more of the teacher's values but it is also particularly likely to be effective. Practitioners have realized and researchers have shown that learning is greatly facilitated by the existence of a meaningful personal relationship between teacher and pupil.[29] Such relationships are a valuable supplement to the relatively asymmetrical relations that characterize formal classroom instruction. It is precisely this kind of personal interaction that is typical of extracurricular activities and other out-of-classroom teacher-pupil contacts. It is probably because of the efficacy of such intimacy that many observers see student activities programs as providers of great learning experiences and as producers of many "desirable" effects in youngsters.[30]

While this process might be most often operative with respect to issue values, there is no reason why regime-level substantive or participatory values held by teachers could not be communicated in the same way. Teachers with unorthodox values would likely find this process their most appropriate outlet.

6. *Teachers as models for political values.*—Second, it is possible that teachers may function as transmitters of values without any conscious effort on their part. Children may acquire values by a process of indentification with teachers rather than as a result of compliance with the imperatives of direct instruction. Children apparently learn not only by the classic "drive reduction" process of traditional learning theory but also by a process of observing and reproducing the actions of adult models.[31] It is probable that teachers serve as models for some behaviors and attitudes for some children, and possible that some of these behaviors and attitudes are political.[32] It might be argued that teachers are difficult to emulate politically since they emit (at least in the classroom) relatively few political stimuli that could act as cues for modeling. Two rejoinders to this are possible. Teachers may signal their political values in places other than the

classroom as discussed immediately above or teachers may, in the course of discussing the political materials inherent in the social studies curriculum, emit cues which inadvertently reveal their participatory, regime-level substantive or issue values to pupils. A variation on the latter theme would find teachers producing affect-free political signals to which pupils *attribute* a particular value position which they subsequently model.

A MEDIATING VARIABLE

The role of educational systems in transmitting basic political values may be more subtle than these six processes in themselves suggest. Communications theories suggest complexities that it behooves researchers to consider. It is possible that the six processes, particularly numbers 2 through 5 are dependent for their over-all effect, if any, upon a particular behavior pattern among students. It is known that communications processes are most effective when mediated by face-to-face contact in small groups.[33] Understanding of the impact of the educational system on pupils may be enhanced by considering the communication process to involve two steps. That is, relevant values may be communicated directly only to a relatively small stratum of interested, bright students who in turn disseminate these values more widely through contacts with peers. The two step flow of communications has long been known to operate widely in the population at large. It has been found particularly relevant to the transmission of political values; there is a stratum of "opinion leaders" who mediate mass-communicated stimuli for much larger audiences of unexposed individuals.[34] It is reasonable to anticipate a similar process among schoolchildren. This is especially true in light of research on patterns of interpersonal relations among youngsters. Groups and informal cliques have been found to be prime channels of adolescent communications. That political content flows in these channels is a distinct possibility.[35]

INPUT PROCESSES

In the discussion of the political value output of the educational system, it was suggested that the processes which are likely to have the most pronounced effects upon pupils focus wholly or in large part upon teachers. In considering political value input, the second major consideration in the question of how society may use the educational system as a vehicle in the transmission of its basic political values, it is thus particularly important to examine the antecedents of teachers' value-related behavior.

Several societal processes which could profoundly affect teachers can be envisioned. Three of the more obvious and direct possibilities are: (1) Through a process of selective recruitment, persons of particular social backgrounds could be brought to the teaching profession. Having already been "properly" socialized within these background contexts, such persons

could be counted upon to teach expected values. (2) Teacher training could be conducted in such a manner that the values expected to be taught are made clear to new recruits. If training is a sufficiently momentous experience, these expectations would be acted upon. (3) Induction to the values of the local community may occur after the teacher has begun work. Such norms may include the teaching of political values congenial to particular elites that may be dominant in a given locale.

Again, though these processes can hardly be thought of as mutually exclusive alternates, they do represent conceptually distinct modes by which value input may reach the educational system through teachers.

1. *Background factors and selective recruitment.*—Though the behavioral consequences of social antecedents are many, there is doubt that teacher background is greatly important in determining the political value output of the schools. There is relatively little evidence that teachers of divergent class or community origins teach notably differently.[36] Though the notion that middle-class values (largely regime-level substantive and issue values) are communicated through the schools because teachers, themselves of the middle class, are representative of those values is venerable in educational sociology, its validity is severely undermined by the observation that the value output of American schools has not notably changed with the recent recruitment of large numbers of relatively lower-class males to the teaching profession.[37]

However, there is hardly sufficient evidence to reject background definitively. Indeed, there are some data which indicate that the size of teachers' communities of origin affect the teaching of participatory values, especially early in educational careers.[38]

Of course, selective recruitment may operate without reference to social background. Relatively overt discrimination against unorthodox values may occur in the selection of particular individuals. Data on this kind of phenomenon, however, is absent for democratic systems.[39]

2. *Teacher training.*—Given the findings of much research, teacher education and training seem more likely to be an efficacious instrument of society's political norms. Many kinds of teacher behavior, from various performance criteria, to "expressivism," to preference for textbooks have been found to depend upon both the kind and the amount of training.[40] It appears that, like other occupations, the profession of teaching involves heavy doses of induction to particular attitudes.[41]

Not only does this appear to be true for strictly professionally relevant values but teachers' norms about political expression also appear to be dependent upon college major and kind of degree.[42] It is thus but a short extension to suggest that the particular political value content which is enunciated to pupils is a function of the teacher training experience. Indeed, in a recent study of political teaching, the expression of participatory

values was found to depend most heavily on teachers' perceptions of values held by college instructors of education.[43]

3. *On-the-job induction.*—As a profession, teachers are known to be compliant, non-competitive, and deferential.[44] Accordingly, if strong expectations on the part of immediately important persons are perceived, it is quite likely that they will conform to the expectations. Teachers in particular and the educational process in general have long been the objects of close community scrutiny and even suspicion. Concern about deviant political ideas, especially regime-level substantive ideas, reaching the minds of the young has agitated many individuals and groups in both public and private positions.[45] Of course, teachers perceive this concern and become quite aware not only of the political expectations held for them but of the sanctions that will be imposed for inappropriate behavior.[46] It is possible that this could result both from direct cognizance of prominent elites or from exposure to senior or supervisory personnel who have become thoroughly familiar with local imperatives.[47] It is known that political teaching behavior varies importantly with local community characteristics.[48] Values attendant upon community variation are somehow reflected in what is taught. Future research may demonstrate that teacher perception of expectation is the connecting link.

CONCLUSION

An understanding of the educational system as a vehicle for the transmission of society's political norms requires knowledge of the content and effective processes of the schools' value output. It also requires an understanding of the character and sources of society's value inputs to the educational system. Though these are clearly vitally important matters, there are few sound empirical findings bearing on these questions.

Perhaps this lack of data is due to the fact that these problems require work in a border zone between educational and political research. Many researchers may be reluctant to enter such areas, for they involve close contact with concepts in disciplines with which they may be unfamiliar. However, the urgency of these problems seems to be calling forth more penetrating investigation despite these inhibiting factors. Indeed, several sizable though preliminary studies are already under way.[49] If there is to be burgeoning research in an area requiring cross-disciplinary efforts, delineations of problems and guides to investigation seem especially desirable. Unfortunately, few, if any, such ordering schemes exist at present.

However, examination of such relevant literature as does exist (both from within these two disciplines and from related fields) enables the construction of typologies of educational system input processes and educational system output processes. These typologies suggest a plentitude of testable hypotheses and provide a framework into which research results

may be placed. They are offered in the hope that they may stimulate investigation and contribute to the ordering of research findings.

NOTES

1. Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, *Politics, Economics and Welfare* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1953), pp. 287–88.

2. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, *The Civic Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), chaps. i, xiii.

3. See, particularly, Herbert Hyman, *Political Socialization* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1959); Fred I. Greenstein, *Children and Politics* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1965); Robert Hess and Judith Torney, *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children* (Chicago: Aldine Press, 1967).

4. Confucius, Plato, Sir Thomas More, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau are but a few of the more prominent writers of this view.

5. This is the focus of the works cited in n. 3 above. In addition, see, e.g., Dean Jaros, Herbert Hirsch, and Fredrick J. Fleron, Jr., "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Subculture," *American Political Science Review*, LXII (June, 1968), 564–75; and M. Kent Jennings and Richard Niemi, "The Transmission of Political Values from Parent to Child," *American Political Science Review*, LXII (March, 1968), 169–184.

6. Almond and Verba, *op. cit.* (see n. 2 above), chap. vi.

7. *Ibid.*, chap. vii.

8. For further discussion of regime-level substantive values, see David Easton and Robert Hess, "The Child's Political World," *Midwest Journal of Political Science*, VI (August, 1962), 229–46.

9. Almond and Verba, *op. cit.* (see n. 2 above), chaps. iv–viii; Lester Milbrath, *Political Participation* (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), esp. chaps. iv, v.

10. See, e.g., James W. Prothro and Charles M. Grigg, "Fundamental Principles of Democracy: Bases of Agreement and Disagreement," *Journal of Politics*, XXII (May, 1960), 276–84; and Herbert McClosky, "Consensus and Ideology in American Politics," *American Political Science Review*, LVIII (June, 1964), 367–82.

11. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1961), pp. 166–67; Byron G. Massialas and C. Benjamin Cox, *Inquiry into Social Studies* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966), pp. 111–35; Charles C. Peters, *Teaching High School History and Social Studies for Citizenship Training* (Coral Gables, Fla.: University of Miami Press, 1948), pp. 65–75; Stanley E. Dimond, *Schools and the Development of Good Citizens: The Final Report of the Citizenship Study* (Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1953).

12. Almond and Verba, *op. cit.* (see n. 2 above), chap. xi.

13. Jack Nelson and Gene Roberts, *The Censors and the Schools* (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1963); Symposium, "Censorship of Textbooks," *National Education Association Journal*, LII (May, 1963), 18–26.

14. See e.g., Stanley E. Ballanger, "The Social Studies and Social Controversy," *School Review*, LXXI (Spring, 1963), 97–111; James P. Shaver, "Reflective Thinking, Values and Social Studies Textbooks," *School Review*, LXXIII (Autumn, 1965), 226–57; Byron G. Massialas, "American Government: We Are the Greatest," in C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas (eds.), *Social Studies in the United States* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967), pp. 167–95;

Donald McNassor, "New Designs for Civic Education in the High School," in Franklin Patterson (ed.), *The Adolescent Citizen* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960), pp. 312–34.

15. See the following commentaries on such research: Stanley E. Dimond, "Citizenship Education," in Chester W. Harris (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960), pp. 206–09; Richard E. Gross and William E. Badger, "Social Studies," in Chester W. Harris (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Educational Research* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960), pp. 1296-1313; Lawrence E. Metcalf, "Research on Teaching the Social Studies," in Nathaniel L. Gage (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand-McNally & Co., 1963), pp. 929–65; Frederick R. Smith and John J. Patrick, "Civics: Relating Social Study to Social Reality," in C. Benjamin Cox and Byron G. Massialas *Social Studies in the United States* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967), pp. 105–25.

16. Gross and Badger, *op. cit.* (see n. 15 above); see also Peters, *op. cit.* (see n. 11 above) pp. 107–40.

17. See, e.g., Edgar Litt, "Civic Education Norms and Political Indoctrination," *American Sociological Review*, XXVIII (February, 1963), 69–75; Robert E. Mainer, "Attitude Change in Intergroup Education Programs," in H. H. Remmers (ed.), *Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1963), pp. 122–54; C. Benjamin Cox and Jack E. Cousins, "Teaching Social Studies in Secondary Schools and Colleges," in Byron Massialas and Frederick R. Smith (eds.), *New Challenges in the Social Studies* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1965), chap. iv; Dimond, "Citizenship Education," (see n. 15 above).

18. See, e.g., Howard E. Wilson, *Education for Citizenship* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938); Roy A. Price, "Citizenship Studies in Syracuse," *Phi Delta Kappan,* XXXIII (December, 1951), 179–81; Earl E. Edgar, "Kansas Study of Education for Citizenship," *Phi Delta Kappan,* XXXIII (December, 1951), 175–78.

19. Kenneth P. Langton and M. Kent Jennings, "Political Socialization and the High School Civics Curriculum," *American Political Science Review,* LXII (September, 1968), p. 858.

20. See, e.g., Gross and Badger, *op. cit.* (see n. 15 above); Peters, *op. cit.* (see n. 11 above), pp. 90–95; and Joseph Katz, "The Political and Economic Beliefs of Student Teachers in the Social Studies," *Social Studies,* XLIV (April, 1953), 142–45.

21. David G. Ryans, "Research on Teacher Behavior in the Context of the Teacher Characteristic Study," in Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (eds.), *Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964), pp. 67–101; Carleton Washburne and Louis Heil, "What Characteristics of Teachers Affect Children's Growth?" *School Review,* LXVIII (Winter, 1960), 420–28.

22. D. Dee Castetter, Lloyd S. Standlee, and Nicholas A. Fattu, *Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Institute of Education, 1954).

23. Bruce J. Biddle, "The Integration of Teacher Effectiveness Research" (pp. 1–40), and Hazel Davis, "Evolution of Current Practices in Evaluating Teacher Competence" (pp. 41–66, in Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (eds.), *Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964).

24. Vernor M. Sims, "The Social Class Affiliations of a Group of Public

School Teachers," *School Review,* LIX (September, 1951), 331–38; George D. Spindler, "Education in a Transforming American Culture," *Harvard Education Review,* XXV (Summer, 1955), 145–56.

25. Louis E. Raths, Merrill H. Harmin, and Sidney B. Simon, *Values and Teaching* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, 1965); Massialas and Cox, *Inquiry into Social Studies,* op. cit. (see n. 11 above), chap. vii; R. Bruce Raup, "The Community Criterion in Judgmental Practice," *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* I (September, 1960), 4–38.

26. Harmon Zeigler, *The Political Life of American Teachers* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), chap. iv.

27. Ballanger, *op. cit.* (see n. 14 above); Mark Chesler, "Values and Controversy in Secondary Social Studies," in Cox and Massialas (eds.) *Social Studies in the United States* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1967), pp. 270–88; John P. Lunstrum, "The Treatment of Controversial Issues in Social Studies Education," in Byron Massialas and Frederick R. Smith (eds.), *New Challenges in the Social Studies* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1965), pp. 121–47.

28. Hess and Torney, *op. cit.* (see n. 3 above).

29. See, e.g., Margaret Willis, *The Guinea Pigs After Twenty Years* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1961), pp. 166, 194–95; William A. Lewis, John T. Lovell, and B. E. Jessee, "Interpersonal Relationship and Pupil Progress," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* XLIV (December, 1965), 396–401; Robert R. Carkhuff and Charles B. Truax, "Toward Explaining Success and Failure in Interpersonal Learning Experiments," *Personnel and Guidance Journal,* XLIV (March, 1966), 723–28.

30. See, e.g., Robert W. Frederick, *The Third Curriculum* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959), chaps. iv.; Morris L. Bigge, "Out of the Classroom Expected Learning Often Comes Through Unexpected Teaching," *Exceptional Children,* XXXIV (September, 1967), 47–50; James W. Bell, "A Comparison of Dropouts and Non-Dropouts on Participation in School Activities," *Journal of Educational Research,* LX (February, 1967), 248–51.

31. Albert Bandura and R. H. Walters, *Social Learning and Personality Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963); Albert Bandura and Aletha Huston, "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* LXIII (September, 1961), 311–18.

32. Hess and Torney, *op. cit.* (see n. 3 above), pp. 111–15.

33. Leon Festinger, Stanley Schacter, and Kurt Back, *Social Pressures in Informal Groups* (New York: Harper & Row, 1950), pp. 7–12, 163–77; Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld, *Personal Influence* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1955), pp. 31–42, 66–81.

34. Bernard Berelson, Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and William N. McPhee, *Voting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954), pp. 109–14; Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet, *The People's Choice* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1944), chap. xvi.

35. See, e.g., Norman E. Gronlund, *Sociometry in the Classroom* (New York: Harper & Row, 1959), esp. pp. 201–3; James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1961), esp. chap. vii; Martin Levin, "Social Climates and Political Socialization," *Public Opinion Quarterly,* XXV (Winter, 1961), 596–606.

36. W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," in Nathaniel L. Gage (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (Chicago: Rand McNally &

Co., 1963), pp. 611–20; Myron Lieberman, *Education as a Profession* (Engle-wood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), p. 468.

37. Zeigler, *op. cit.* (see n. 26 above), p. 33.

38. Dean Jaros, "Transmitting the Civic Culture: The Teacher and Polit-ical Socialization," *Social Science Quarterly*, XLIX (September, 1968), 284–95.

39. Of course, such selection is rather overtly practiced in ideologically oriented totalitarian regimes. See, e.g., I. L. Kandel, *The Making of Nazis* (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1935), p. 17.

40. Nolan C. Kearney and Patrick Rocchio, "The Effect of Teacher Educa-tion on Teachers' Attitudes," *Journal of Educational Research*, VII (November, 1956), p. 703; Symposium, "Teaching Teachers to Provide Liberal Educa-tion," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XVIII (Summer, 1967), 133–152; Mas-sialas and Cox, *Inquiry into Social Studies* (see n. 11 above), pp. 279–98.

41. Morris Rosenberg, *Occupations and Values* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), pp. 18–20.

42. M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Zeigler, "Political Expressivism Among High School Teachers: The Intersection of Community and Occupational Values," pp. 24–28 (mimeo. ms., to appear in Roberta S. Sigel [ed.], *Learning About Politics: Studies in Political Socialization* [New York: Random House, Inc., in press]).

43. Jaros, "Transmitting the Civic Culture" (see n. 38 above).

44. Ward Mason, *The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations* (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1961), pp. 21–22; Robert G. Corwin, "Militant Professionalism, Initiative, and Com-pliance in Public Education," *Sociology of Education*, XXXVIII (Summer, 1965), 310–35.

45. Neal Gross, *Who Runs Our Schools?* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958), chaps. ii, iii; Nelson and Roberts, *op. cit.* (see n. 13 above).

46. Zeigler, *op. cit.* (see 26 above) pp. 121–25.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 128.

48. Jennings and Zeigler, *op. cit.* (see n. 42 above), pp. 10–17.

49. Hess and Torney, *op. cit.* (see n. 3 above); Langton and Jennings, *op. cit.* (see n. 19 above).